JC 345
P4

HISTORY OF LIBERTY.

Petrie

THE

HISTORY OF LIBERTY.

BY

MARGARET S. PETRIE,

MANLIUS, N. Y.

1874.

Entered according to act of Congress, in the year 1874, by

MARGARET S. PETRIE,

in the office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

PART FIRST.

—o—

WHAT IS LIBERTY?

It has been said that the history of liberty has yet to be written, and that from the imperfect knowledge of ancient nations and the ever changing forms of government, requiring great research and a vast amount of labor, it will be long yet ere the work will be done; but it seems to me that as human nature is the same in all countries and in all ages, influenced and controlled by the same ever recurring principles, so the history of liberty is not so much seen in the progress of governments as regards successive time, as in the progress of those principles which form the essentials of government and which may now be seen in their comparative degrees of excellence among the different nations of the earth.

Is it any wonder the history of that has not been written which has so recently been attained? One must reach the mountain top before he can include in his survey the landscape it commands; a single step short takes so much from the completeness of the view. So in the history of any principle. It is necessary that it be attained in its fullness before its progressive growth can be identified.

In writing the history of liberty, it is not so much the ever changing form of governments and our imperfect

knowledge of ancient nations, in which the difficulty consists, as the want of our ability to come in contact with their inner life. Whatever of change there may be in the earth's surface, whether of elevation or depression, whether a swallowing up of what was once visible or an upheaving of what wasbefore unknown ; whatever, the effect, the cause is the mighty force within. So whether alike in the steady progress of a nation, or in its mighty upheavings, that which history records is but the effect. The real difficulty in tracing the progress of liberty is to judge of that inner life by that which history *does* record.

There are two facts which, perhaps more than any other in the course of the world, seem to us anomalous.

The first is, the apparent connection between a high degree of intelligence as seen in literature, the arts, and even to a great degree in government, with refinement of manners ; the apparent connection of these, especially in theory with purity of morals, and the striking contrast which the practice of ancient Greece and Rome, and that of modern France and Italy, presents.

The second is, that while christianity is acknowledged to be essential to liberty, instances exist where those nations or parts of nations in which infidelity prevails, the tree of liberty flourishes most luxuriantly ; while in those nations or portions of nations which most completely accept Revelation, there is the tree of liberty most blighted.

The history of liberty may be said to be included in two parallel lines. The first is, the development of the principle that a balance of the elements of our nature and of government is essential to liberty. The second, the history of the progress and adoption of those principles which can be exercised only when that balance has been attained.

When Madame Roland, on being led to the scaffold,

uttered the words, "O Liberty! Liberty! how many crimes have been committed in thy name," well might she have added, *and how little is thy nature understood.*

There is no word to which greater differences of meaning have been applied than to the word *liberty.* We speak of individual liberty and of national liberty. However various in form the expression may be, the various definitions of individual liberty, with very few exceptions, may be included in this: that liberty consists in freedom from restraint, in the exercise of natural rights, and that as population increases the individual surrenders a portion of those rights for the good of society. But what are *natural rights?* Blackstone, in his Commentaries, page 8th of Rights of Things, speaks of our "rational faculties" and our "natural faculties;" evidently applying the latter to the faculties included in the physical element of our nature. With all deference, I would ask, is this distinction just? Are not the moral and the mental faculties just as much a part of our nature as are the physical faculties? If not, at what time do they enter in and become part of that nature? True, the nourishment and exercise they require for their development are different from those required by the physical faculties; but, though latent, they as really exist in infancy as do those physical powers which can only be exercised when the growth of the physical nature has been attained. May it not be said that this erroneous distinction of the elements of man's nature has been a principal cause of the difficulty which has been felt in defining *Liberty?*

It is of course a natural right for us to exercise our natural faculties, and when those are considered as included in our physical nature alone, a lack of restraint in the exercise of them would be regarded as freedom. Perhaps one reason why liberty and freedom came to

be used synonymously was on account of the servitude of the lower classes among ancient nations; when by any means they gained their freedom, it was considered they had liberty.

National liberty, as it has been variously defined, may be con-idered under two heads. One, that of independence of a foreign power; the other, a due observance of law under a well regulated monarchy.

Liberty and independence are words which are often applied to nations as parallel and even synonymous, but they are as far asunder as the poles. A nation is independent when it does not owe allegiance to a foreign power; in other words, when the executive is within its own borders, whether that executive be president, king, emperor, sultan or tyrant.

Russia, when it had its millions of serfs, was independent; France is independent; the United States, before the rebellion, were independent, but who would say that with slavery they had the fullness of liberty. It remains to be seen whether the idea be correct, which so generally prevails, that a due observance of law under a well regulated monarchy *is* Liberty.

THE NATURE AND PROGRESS OF THE PHYSICAL, THE MORAL, THE MENTAL ELEMENTS OF OUR NATURE AND OF GOVERNMENT.

Nations are but an aggregate of individuals, so that the same elements which most generally predominate in the individuals of a nation, will be the predominating elements in the government of that nation. As the physical, the moral and the mental elements include the whole of man's nature, so do the principles which correspond with these include all that has ever existed in government.

The physical element in man is his body, which is capable not only of receiving impressions and performing functions peculiar to itself, but is also the medium through which the other elements of man's nature, the moral and the mental, act, alike receiving and imparting influences. Now when we consider the different governments that have existed, the most ancient of which we have any knowledge, the Roman—heathen and papal equal in their administrative or executive energy—the Eastern nations with their enervating civilization, the German with its intense nationality, Spain with its conservatism, vacillating France, England with its progressive liberalism, the United States with their tendency to expansion in all directions, Mexico and the South American States with their ever balancing, China and India with their conservative heathenism—all these alike have as their basis the physical element, which is the frame work of government.

What then is it which makes the difference between these, a difference so great that it is frequently attributed to a different fundamental cause. Not only is the fundamental principle in all these governments the same, but also much that seems antagonistic in each separate government as, for instance, aristocracy as conflicting with

monarchy. In countries where slavery exists, the relation of master and slave is spoken of as opposite in their natures, whereas the fundamental element in each is identical; so also is that which is spoken of in contrast, anarchy and tyranny. Not only so, but also what seems if possible still more opposite, barbarism and an enervating civilization. Whence then the apparent difference? Whence the influence that diffuses those delicate touches of light and shade which make it so hard for us at times to define their boundaries?

It must be remembered that the elements of man's nature do not exist separately, but each in connection with the others. The body without the soul and mind is dead. Whatever may be the nature of the soul after death, as long as it animates the body, it can only act in conjunction with it. If it be possible to imagine the existence of mind in the abstract, it would then certainly be too abstract to act independently. It is only when these elements exist in their due proportion that the full man is developed.

Look at all the races and nationalities that have ever existed, white and black, with as many shades between as possible. Let a person stand in one of the great thoroughfares of the commercial centres of the world and observe the individuals as they pass, he can tell to a certainty whether they are African, German, Irish, English, Chinese. Consider also man more particularly as regards his moral and mental developments, as a Nero and a Howard, a savage and a Lord Chesterfield, an idiot and a Newton.

Think of all the individuals in any one country, how each has his identity—some tall, some short; some large, some small; some honest, others dishonest; some vulgar, others refined; some intelligent, others ignorant; and so on, in an endless diversity, and then consider that one country is but a type of each and every nation

that has ever existed, and that this countless multitude of differences is but the effect of a combination in different proportions of the three elements of man's nature. Knowing all this, can we wonder at the equally endless diversity of phenomena as seen in nations and governments? Influenced as these elements are by the geography of a country, its climate, its association with surrounding nations, we find the combinations of the elements of government, instead of being computed by the relations of numbers, to be as varied as the combinations of the kaleidoscope.

The physical is not only the most tangible of the elements of man's nature, but it is also that which is the first developed. Take any nation of heathens or savages, or whatever you choose to call them; no matter whether it be ancient barbarians, as the Huns under Attila, the Picts and Scots of Britain, the Goths and Scandinavians of Northern Europe; or whether it be the natives of the Sandwich Islands, of Madagascar, the aborigines of our own continent—no matter in what country or in what age of the world, that race is in its infancy. Whether that infancy last one year or a thousand years, the principle is the same.

But what is the order of development? Of all the nations that have ever existed, we find a belief in a superior intelligence, whatever form it may take. Whatever the creed may be, the mother instils its belief into the mind of her child. As that child advances, its mental powers are developed in accordance with the degree of development of the minds by which it is surrounded. This, and this only, is the order of growth, whether of the individual or of the nation, whether in the first age of the world or in the last, whether among heathen or Christian, whether on the Eastern or the Western continent.

As it is of the utmost importance that the order of

development should be kept in mind, we will analyze it a little more closely.

All know that the physical part of our nature is all that has a development in infancy ; true, the moral and the mental elements of our nature do then really and truly exist, but as yet they are merely latent, they are not developed. As the child advances in life, the moral element in his nature begins to dawn. He has a consciousness of right and wrong. The elements of some belief are instilled into his mind. It is then the mental element begins ; the nature of his belief being pagan, heathen philosophy, Mohammedanism, Jewish, or some one of the different manifestations of the Christian religion, according to the teachings he may receive.

Not only does the mental element begin then to influence the moral element, it also influences the physical element. The child learns that if he puts his hand in the fire, it will burn him ; that if he goes out into the rain, he will get wet. He likes such and such articles of food, as parched corn with meat or fish roasted on sticks or laid on coals, or he eats rats and puppies, or he abstains from pork and is careful not to eat flesh with the blood thereof, or he eats blood puddings and pork and beans ; sleeps on skins of animals spread on the ground, on beds with every want of neatness, or in those supplied by a true refined taste, and all other of his social habits correspond with these.

Having noticed the order of the development of man's nature and of government, let us now examine more minutely the peculiar functions of each element.

The physical element in government is its executive principle, that through which government acts, and in its relation to the other elements of government—the moral and the mental—may be compared to the body through which the mind and soul act.

Suppose an individual traveling among the Hotten-

tots, the Esquimaux, the American Indians; he would not hesitate to say that everything he saw, their mode of dress, the manner of preparing their food, their social habits, whatever existed as government, partook largely of the physical element. Let him pass among what are called semi-civilized nations, as the Chinese and Oriental nations generally, with their advance in their mode of living, their architecture, their government—whatever their mode of organization, it would still be the physical element he would see; but suppose he visit Egypt in the time of the building of the pyramids, witness the embalming of their kings, the splendor of the courts of the Ptolemies; or suppose he pass through Rome in her Augustan age, notice the splendor of its architecture, the races, the gladiatorial combats, the triumphal processions; or suppose him a traveller in Europe at the present time, he will notice its governments, its agriculture, its fleets and armies, arsenals, manufactories—everything man has made, it will still be the physical element he will see.

A painter, worthy the name of artist, when painting the human features, will use the same materials and be guided by the same rules as to the mechanical part of his work as any ordinary painter painting a sign or any object in a landscape; but with proportion, outlines, coloring, shading, the artist will combine *expression*. He will mirror, as near as may be, the soul and mind within.

Just so with the different manifestations of the physical element. The most enlightened government on earth and the noblest cathedral have equally with the wigwam and the tradition of the savage, the physical element as the fundamental part in their construction, but with the government and the cathedral there is an important *something* added.

We will now consider the nature and functions of the moral element. By the moral element we do not mean

morality, indeed it may be the very opposite of what is understood by that term, but we mean that principle called conscience within all mankind, heathen as well as Christian, and we unite with this whatever it may be that gives direction to this principle, in other words, educates it. This may be a belief in Brahma or Buddha, in one or all of the gods of the Pantheon, or in the unknown God whom St. Paul declared to the Athenians, or it may be that which is the greatest anomaly—the belief of the atheist, who is not only without God in the world, but without even the hope of the heathen. It may consist of the self-indulgence of the Epicureans, or the self-denial of the Stoics; the licentiousness which made part of heathen worship, or the purity of the vestal virgins; the faint glimmerings of immortality contained in heathen philosophy, or a belief in annihilation; in short, every influence that may be brought to bear upon conscience as influencing action.

It will readily be seen how the moral element influences the physical element. Take one of the more important influences—for instance, a belief in the immortality of the soul. How it ennobles everything. If there be a principle within us that never dies, then of course this life is but a preparation, and the nature of that preparation is determined by the nature of that future life, that immortality. Does that future consist of sensual pleasures? then will the like pleasures be the great aim in this life. Is it an immortality of purity and worship? then will the body be brought into subjection and made meet for the indwelling of the immortal spirit, and that worship which is to continue will be begun on earth. Whatever direction the moral element may take, will give character to the act included in the physical element.

We will now consider the effect the moral element has on the mental. By this we mean that according to the

nature of one's belief, will they build a pantheon or a cathedral, paint a Venus or a Madonna, represent in sculpture a Jupiter or the Son of God manifest in the flesh; they will write a treatise on Buddha or the Prophet, on Judaism or Christianity, on Romanism or Protestantism.

Having considered the nature and functions of the different elements separately, each as distinctly as possible from the others, we will now treat them in a more general way and with reference to the two great principles which include all minor influences that every where and in all ages of the world have been brought to bear upon mankind and upon government—heathenism and christianity.

The Mosaic law bears the same relation to government in general that Judaism bore to the Gentile world. The middle wall of partition needed to be broken down, and this was done as effectually by the sacrifice of Christ as regards civil government, as to the Church of Christ which ever thereafter was to include Gentile as such as well as Jew. Whatever was of universal application in the law of Moses being included in the law of Christ, we have as before mentioned, the two general principles underlying and including all influences that can be brought to bear upon government—heathenism and christianity.

As the most perfect representation of the principle, we will consider civilization and government where it attained its highest perfection under heathen influence, in ancient Greece and Rome.

As some of the ancient philosophers declared it to be impossible for the human mind unaided to discover the nature of the soul after death, to understand the nature and attributes of an overruling power, of the relation man sustained to that power, so was it impossible for

them to carry civilization and government farther than did the Greeks and Romans.

With all their love of philosophy, the more elevated ideas they had of man's nature as shown by their deifying sense of the noblest attributes of mind, the dim perception they seem to have had of the eternity of the soul, of future rewards and punishments, there was no one to speak with that authority necessary to command the respect of all. Though one law-giver did not always oppose another, he endeavored to attain the same end by different measures. Thus, though some whose laws on the whole exerted a beneficial influence, strove to adopt measures that would render them permanent, they were unable to do so, the influence of their laws passing away in a great measure with their lives. Besides, there being no religious belief held in common, that is among different nations and successive times, there was nothing that spoke to them with authority, and thus serve as a rallying point around which the promoters of civilization might cluster their principles, and thus, by their united effort, enable them to carry out in government that principle which is its life, that of progress.

As a natural result of all this, we find a lack of harmony in the development of the elements of man's nature. We see the extremes of popular ignorance and a nobility of literature and philosophy, of master and slave, of the grossest sensuality and a subtile refinement.

Heathenism carried humanity up to a certain point, but it could go no further. The high degree of civilization attained by the Greeks and Romans is so often alluded to, that it may seem preposterous to say that even there, there was a lack of the mental element, but there was, and that in a most important point, its existence among the people.

In order that knowledge exercise its highest good, it must be diffused among the people, and the knowledge of *that* is an *art* they never lost. In what way may their lack of knowledge be seen? In all countries where there are extremes in the social and political status of the people, as noble and serf, master and slave, labor is performed by the many for the benefit of the few—the privileged class.

In all ages, knowledge has been considered power, consequently it has been kept on the side of those in authority, not merely for their personal gratification, but that authority might continue.

Now any original idea, any invention, any advance of the principles in science and art, is just as much the result of labor as if performed by the hand. When by accident a slave or a serf or any individual of an inferior class, performs such labor; it is not the author, the inventor, and the class to which he belongs that reaps the benefit of his work, but it is the ruling class.

Suppose the invention to be some theory of government, or any thing which if generally known, would be considered to have a tendency to weaken the authority of the powers that be, the inventor pays the penalty with his life. If the invention consist of any thing usually included under that term, or if it be some important principle in science or the arts, the inventor is allowed, perhaps employed, to make use of it or to apply it, as the case may be, for the benefit of the privileged class but it is not allowed to be generally known, so that if the authorities are too lazy to acquire the knowledge for themselves, when the inventor dies, his knowledge dies with him.

It is to this principle—the separating of labor from the reward of labor—more than to the destruction of books, that we are indebted for what are called the lost arts. No one supposes that the art of embalming was gener-

ally known at the time it was practised, or that it was used on any but royalty, or, at least, the nobility. The same principle will hold true in every instance where the skill of the ancients rivalled that of the present. Unfortunately, the practice of the principle did not die with that of which it caused the death. The present manufacture of the Gobelin Tapestry in Paris, furnishes an exact parallel.

Much has been said as to the comparative merit of heathen and christian art, but the subject is by no means exhausted. Many take the ground that Christianity is restraining in its influence upon art. But what is art? There are two things art is not. It consists neither in skill of execution nor in richness of material; were it merely mechanical skill, a coin with the ten commandments engraved upon it, or a finely constructed engine, would be examples of perfect art; were it richness of material, then would an imperial crown be a crown of art.

Art is the expression of an idea, consequently whatever enlarges and ennobles idea, enlarges and ennobles art. Now as to the comparative merit of heathen and christian art, there is one aspect in which the subject may be viewed, which presents it with mathematical certainty, in that a whole is greater than a part.

Take the most exalted idea of heathen art, all will admit that their knowledge of the attributes of the deity, the nature of man and the relation he sustains to his Creator—if indeed he be not self-existent—the immortality of the soul, consequently every thing connected with a future life was circumscribed, it had a limit, it could be defined. There was a point beyond which their imagination could not reach. But where is the limit to Christian idea. To whatever the heathen possessed that was true and inspiring in art, Christianity

adds all that elevates the Christian religion above that of all the gods of the Pantheon. When the idea and the execution of it harmonizes, we have the perfection of art. That which Schlegel says of poetry, is equally true of art in general. "The proper business of poetry is to represent only the eternal; that which is at all places, and in all times, significant and beautiful."

Having considered the nature of the influences of heathenism upon the elements of government and upon society as seen in the most advanced heathen civilization, we will now notice the effect of Christianity upon government.

The idea seems too generally to prevail that the worth of Christianity is to be judged by different rules from that of other religions, but it is not so. Christianity has not changed human nature, but it has revealed that nature to us. Just in proportion that any system of religion, whether it be heathen or christian, is in conformity or adapted to man's nature, just in that proportion will be the degree of influence which it will exert, and it is only when the founder of any system of religion comprehends the whole of man's nature, that he can devise a system of laws the obedience of which will ensure the fullest and most complete development of that nature. In short, the Creator of man, and He only, can be the author of a system unfolding the nature of that existence and prescribing laws by which it may be governed; and just in proportion that the adaptation of the one to the other is seen, will the Author of the one and the Creator of the other be recognized.

Why is it that the civilization of ancient Greece and Rome began to wane when it had reached a point far below that attained by modern Christian nations? Does the law of progress which seems stamped upon every thing with which man has to do include Christianity, or does Christianity originate the law of progress, or is

Christianity an exception to what seems to be a general tendency?

What are the distinguishing features of Christianity as affecting government? If the Godhead be supreme, then must His authority be supreme also. If He be the Father of all, the co-relative to this is the brotherhood of man. If the highest wisdom of man has declared it impossible for him to save himself, has this Supreme God, before unknown, provided a way of salvation, and are all included in that plan? Were the longings of the ancient poets and philosophers for immortality a mere chimera, or is there in reality a principle of divinity within us? Is there an ennobling of man's whole nature, or is his measure determined? What is the standard set for his attainment? Is it a noble physical development, such as we may suppose the Roman guards to have possessed? Is it a morality either Stoic or Epicurean; or is it a mental development uniting all the attainments of heathen intelligence?

Far from all this, the length and breadth, the height and depth of all human philosophy had confessed itself unable to determine it It is that which seems so simple but at the same time is so sublime in its comprehension. "Be ye therefore perfect even as your Father who is in Heaven is perfect." And what is meant by this? Does it mean that man can attain to the purity, the justice of that Being who speaks of himself as a righteous God? Does it mean that man should consider it possible, by his utmost exertions, to attain to the wisdom of the Infinite? Far from it. It means that he should so comply with the laws which his Creator has given for the regulation of his whole being, that body, soul, and mind, each proportionably developed, the whole should form an harmonious unity complete in quality though still far below its Maker in degree.

Surely, with such a perfection, the most earnest aspirations of the human mind and soul can well be content.

The influence of Christianity upon government was felt but little for the first few centuries, owing to the converts being mostly among the subjects of law, instead of the makers of it; though many in authority could not but acknowledge the beneficial effect it had on those who professed the faith, in that it made them more obedient to the civil law whenever it did not come in conflict with their worship of the one God.

As time passed and Christianity numbered among its converts kings and emperors, instead of its having the effect which the peaceful but at the same time, powerful influence of its nature indicated it should have, it was too generally used by the designing and powerful among its believers as a cloak for carrying out their ambitious purposes by shielding themselves behind the authority which they appropriated from Christianity. All experience shows that where a general knowledge of the precepts and promises of the Gospel are wanting, there will not be wanting those who will pervert these and make use of the awful sanctions accompanying them to enforce their authority.

The principle to which we have before alluded, of confining knowledge for the benefit of the privileged classes practised by heathen Greece and Rome, was continued under Christianity—though the command to teach the Gospel to all nations was not neglected, the people ghnerally were not allowed the direct knowledge of that Gospel.

If ever apparent opposites furnished a parallel, it is heathen and papal Rome. Not only do they resemble each other in their intense administrative or executive energy, but also in their use, or abuse, of the mental element. Both have given to the world much that is noble in literature and art, and both exhibit as an essen-

tial element of their system, the ignorance and consequent degradation of the lower classes.

Having considered the tendency of any system of religion, whether heathen or a perversion of the Christian, that does not include the brotherhood of all, to keep a portion in ignorance, in other words, to prevent a general diffusion of the mental element; we will now consider the effect of true Christianity, by which we mean simply Christianity not partially but fully developed.

The Reformers, by giving the Bible to the people, enabled them to apply its promises and teachings for themselves instead of their being administered to them by others. The knowledge which had been confined to a few now became general, and as matter when expanded produces a greater effect than when confined, so knowledge as it burst from the bonds in which it had been held, expanded with such force that thrones and empires, civilization and government, but more than all, or rather including all, mind itself was freed from its long imprisonment.

What was the knowledge that effected this result? Is there one Mediator between God and man, or is the Mediatorial work shared by lesser intelligences? Is death the end of preparation for eternity, or is there a place and time where preparation can be continued and perfected? Is God the judge of all and does he reserve the judgment of all to the great day as his peculiar prerogative, or has He delegated part of that authority to others? Is salvation the free gift of God, or may it be purchased with money? Does God intend that all, or only a portion of his created beings should have the knowledge of His revealed will. If God is our Father, then does He look with peculiar favor on a portion of His children, or are all equal in His sight?

It will readily be seen how the knowledge of these influenced their daily life. If indulgences could not ab-

solve from sin, then a purer life was needed. If the Son of God is the only mediator, then faith in the merits of His atonement, and the consequent necessity of a compliance with His commands in order to receive the benefits of that atonement. If there be no purgatory, then is it necessary so to live here as believing there will be no chance for preparation hereafter. If salvation is for all, then all have a right to a personal knowledge of the means of salvation. It was not merely whether they believed so and so, but whether they did so and so, and it will be found of universal application that those nations in which the belief of the practical part of Christianity is the strongest, have made the greatest advance in that which is known as progress.

Does it then follow that a belief in what may be called the theory of Christianity, is of no importance? By no means. The effect of an extreme perversion of the doctrines of Christianity is seen in Mahomedanism, and sooner or later any lesser degree of error in doctrine will surely be followed by error in practise.

That word which best expresses, not only the mode of government but the direction of thought before the Reformation, is *concentration*, and that word which best expresses the same after the Reformation, is *diffusion*. The light of knowledge which may be said to include all, like the light of the sun, when concentrated will consume that which it would enlighten if diffused.

Another important difference more particularly connected with government and for which the diffusion of knowledge prepared the way, is this, that before the Reformation the influence of government upon the individual was directly from without. By the word government we include all influences that were brought to bear upon individuals separately or collectively, as preventing or compelling action.

After the Reformation, government proceeded more

from within. The moral and the mental elements of man's nature being developed he found he had a higher law of action within him, a more noble restaining influence—in other words, self-government, than any external influence—in other words, force, that could be brought to bear upon his physical element. This is indeed the key to the whole of the influence upon individuals and upon government by an unfettered Christianity.

It is this individual self-command which includes so much, not only the control of those passions and energies which may be in excess, but also the calling up of those forces of soul and mind as well as of body which may be latent; it is all this which constitutes that moral force, making a lever of which Archimedes never dreamed and which *is* moving the world—not downwards by crushing and grinding as do tyrants and armies, but moving it onwards and upwards.

Before and after the Christian era, it was principally through the physical element that government influenced the individual; force was met by force, the stronger subdued the weaker and when the weaker became the stronger, the tables were turned. After the Reformation, the moral and the mental elements were developed, not that there was a decrease of the physical element but it was ennobled and made more fitting to be the medium through which the moral and the mental elements should find expression.

Combine and concentrate all of the physical element in the different civilizations that have existed—the Assyrian, the Persian, the Egyptian, the Grecian, the Roman—and you will then fall short as to the comparative value of the physical element presented by modern Christian nations.

We do not mean simply the number, variety, and splendor of public buildings, the immense navies belong-

ing to different nations, steamships crossing oceans, and railroads crossing continents, telegraphs encircling the world with instantaneous thought, roads over mountains and through them, it is not this and much of which this is only a beginning; but we mean the comforts possessed by the poor, the more general diffusion of wealth, hospitals for the relief of suffering of every form, the greater regard paid to the life and rights of the lower classes, the elevation of labor, the general use of labor-saving machines thus giving the laborer time for self-culture, the more merciful treatment of prisoners of war, the law of nations, the acknowledged right of the weakest nation to existence equally with the strongest; it is this which we mean and much of which this is only a beginning.

No matter how slightly two lines converge, they must meet somewhere. We have seen that in infancy, whether of the individual or of the nation, there is the greatest difference in the degree of development of the elements of our nature and of government; as we progress towards a full, perfect, and complete manhood the difference lessens till a balance is reached—and what is that balance? It is LIBERTY, and this is the point towards which all history tends.

The progress of the elements of our nature towards a balance is the epitome of all history, and LIBERTY IS THE EXERCISE OF THAT BALANCE.

The question may be asked, if liberty is the result of the harmonius development of the elements of our nature, and of government, why, when modern governments show such a degree of progress towards that balance, there is not more of national liberty? We answer by asking, why, among Christian nations, there is not more of Christianity.

The highest attainments of a nation can never be considered the standard to which the majority of that

nation have attained Though Italy seems to be the home of the arts, no one for a moment considers the majority of Italians, artists; though science flourishes in France, no one considers the majority of the people its votaries; because England has produced a Newton and a Shakspeare, no one thinks of all Englishmen either as philosophers or poets.

When the elements of our nature had progressed towards a balance for hundreds and thousands of years, each having at times its triumphs and obscurities, all being strengthened and ennobled by the discipline they had undergone till it seemed as if each separately had attained the utmost degree of development short of a balance of the whole; at what point in history is it that we find that balance reached?

Just as long as government recognizes a difference in the birthright of any of its citizens, no matter how slight that difference may be, just so long will full, perfect and complete liberty be impossible. When the equality of all as to the right of possession of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, was declared, then was the necessity of a balance of the elements of government first endorsed by a nation.

The sun will sooner again stand still upon Gibeon, and the moon in the valley of Aijalon, than this principle, once declared, will ever be lost. God some times, for some wise purpose, suspends the operation of those laws by which He controls matter, but moral laws *never*. Heaven and earth may pass away, but one jot, or one tittle of the law shall not fail.

One after another of the nations of the world, having first made the necessary degree of progress, will join in striking the balance. The nature of the progress being complete, all will unite in developing it, till, though the Infinite may never be reached, it would seem as if there were no bounds to the finite.

Having reached the attainment of that principle—Liberty—towards which all history tends, and the general adoption of which will include all there may be of history in the future, we will now take a survey and notice a few of the more important inferences which may be deduced from the principles we have considered.

Of the first importance and the foundation of all progress both in the individual and in government is this, that as the individual cannot climb without having some point in view above the level of his bodily stature, and further, that he must take all the portions of his body, not leaving behind either his hands, his feet, or his head but must carry all; so if we would have progress of our individual nature and of government, we must reach at some standard higher than the level of our human nature, and which will demand the exercise of all our faculties; not simply of the mind with its perceptions, its imaginings, its reasonings; the soul with its reverence or its superstitions; or the body with the full energy of its passions and desires; but our whole being, body, soul and mind, each so acting that they mutually help one another.

It is because all heathen religions are on a level with our nature, that they have been found unable to carry our nature beyond that level.

It is Christianity alone, true and unfettered, which furnishes a standard far above our nature, and the attainment of which demands the exercise of all the energies of our whole being, making the full and complete developement of all necessary. It is this which constitutes real progress, and which progress will continue 'till the *Standard* shall be reached.

Another inference is, that according to the nature, attributes, or whatever you choose to call it, of the being, superior intelligence, any idea represented by an idol, a god, whether it be "Jehovah, Jove, or Lord"—whatever

it may be, will give character to the physical and the mental elements in mankind and in government. In other words, that government is belief in action. To be in the strict sense of the word an atheist, that is, without any religious belief, is utterly impossible.

Another inference is, that wherever there seems to be a predominance of any one of the elements, it is not so much from an excess of that element as from a lack of the others.

Another and an exceedingly practical inference is, that wherever there seems to be a predominance of the moral element, no matter in what age of the world or what form it may take, whether it be heathen mythology, Mahommedanism, Romanism, Mormonism, Spiritualism—no matter what it may be, that is active in its operations and which makes every thing bend to the furtherance of the system ; it will be found upon a close analysis, without one single exception, that it is not simply for the increase of the moral element, but for the carrying out of measures included in the physical element.

Another important inference and which, if more generally recognized, would prevent confusion, is that legislation is but a small part of government, and that other influences affect government more than legisation.

Another inference is, that no matter how specious the garb may be, any measure that has a tendency to strengthen the physical element without at the same time purifying and ennobling the moral and the mental elements, is inimical to liberty ; and on the other hand, any influence that has a tendency to enervate the physical element cannot be ennobling to the moral and the mental elements.

The last important inference we will notice and which may be said to include all the others, is this, a good degree of progress towards a balance in the development of the elements of government, is absolutely necessary

before liberty can become national. In other words, it is utterly impossible to jump from a government where the physical element strongly predominates, as in anarchy or a despotism, to a government where all the elements are developed, that is—to LIBERTY.

PART SECOND.

—o—

FEDERATION.

Among the most important principles consequent upon the exercise of a balance of the elements of government, are Federation, Free Soil, and Representation according to the Population.

It has been said that thus far federacies have proved failures, and, as proof of the truth of the assertion, reference has been made to the Amphyctionic Council, the Achaean League, the United Provinces of Holland, in Mexico, and Central America.

When, or under what circumstances, have federacies flourished?

When there has existed some cause which produced unity of action, whether that cause consisted of danger from without, or from a desire of mutual advancement. The motive power which produced this unity of action, was the equality of the different States simply as members of the confederacy without the slightest regard to the rank which they might hold individually in respect to wealth and population.

Now no conclusion can be more certain than that whatever of legislation, or anything else, has a tendency

to continue that equality, will continue the confederacy. Perhaps no stronger instance can be given of the carrying out of this vital principle independent of any extraneous force, than is afforded by the United States. The Federal Constitution makes every State in the Union, though its population and wealth be computed by thousands, equal with those States in which the population and wealth are numbered by millions. Whatever may be termed the National interests of the *people* of a State, are provided for by the representatives of the *people* of that State in the National Legislature, but the interests and rights of a *State* must be provided for by the representatives of that *State, as one of the Union, as a member of the Confederacy*, in the Federal Senate, which body is the representative of the *States* and not the representative of the *individuals* composing those States.

The importance of preserving this distinction cannot be overestimated. The subject which is sometimes agitated, of the people voting for the Senators of the Nation instead of their being chosen by the State Legislatures, strikes at the very root of this distinction. True, all the States, the smallest as well as the largest, would at first vote for an equal number of Senators; but the principle, the majority rules, is so incorporated into the working of the Constitution that the right of the larger States to a number of Senators proportionate to their wealth and population would certainly follow. It would be merely a question of time.

This principle, the right of the *States* of a Confederacy to an equal representation in the Federal Senate, that is, to a perfect equality as members of the Union, if it be not the corner stone, it is the key stone of a Confederacy.

FREE SOIL.

This portion of our subject includes a statement of the

successive modes of tenure from the time the soil is "Nature's own domain," but more particularly when it is claimed by a few proprietors, to the time when "every man sits under his own vine and fig tree," with the influence of each upon government.

REPRESENTATION ACCORDING TO THE POPULATION.

I have now reached that subject which is not only the last in the order I have chosen, but it is fitting it should be the conclusion, in that it can be exercised only when the principles previously discussed have been attained. and also because it includes them all. It is the principle in which they all culminate; indeed, true representation is not so much a principle in government as that for which government itself is instituted.

All representation may be included under two general heads—the right of the individual to represent, and the right of the individual to be represented.

Unnder the first head—the right of the individual to represent—may be included all those forms of representation, the exercise of which is usually prefaced or accompanied by the declaration of "by Divine right," from the merely physical superiority—the might making right—of the savage, to the "Dei Gratia" of "His" or "Her Most Christian Majesty."

The other head—the right of the individual to be represented—places the divine right at the other end of the balance, that of the people to choose who shall represent them.

As all the shades of representation included under the first head are mere successive steps in the progress towards a true, individual representation, we will mostly confine our remarks to that form of representation which is generally styled, *representation according to the population.*

What is the *basis* of representation according to the population? Ask an individual and in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the answer will be, "one to so many thousand inhabitants." This it will be seen has reference merely to members without any regard to the status of the individual.

No matter what the form of government may be, it is impossible for all to take a direct part either in making the laws or executing them for the simple reason, if there were no other, that in that case there would be none to govern; but aside from this there must be producers and whenever a less number than a reasonable proportion cease to be producers, no matter what the cause may be, that country suffers.

In order that the representation be faithful, is it sufficient that it be direct, that is, that the person represented chooses for himself who shall represent him.

Legislation will always be shaped by whatever interest is represented, whether it be recognized as a basis or not. Among savages, anything worthy the name of legislation is absolutely wanting; there is no law but brute force and those individuals who possess this in the greatest degree are the most faithful representatives of their race. When physical power is concentrated, which we call despotism, the despot acts in the place of, if not for, those beneath him; in that case, the will of the tyrant whether for good or for evil is the only interest represented, and whatever there may be of legislation, he is both legislator and executive. When we come to what is called a limited monarchy, the prerogatives of the monarch as legislator are modified or shared with either an aristocracy or alone, or an aristocracy combined with legislators chosen either more or less directly by the people.

Although there seems to be a great difference in the

carrying out of these several forms of government, they will be seen to all agree, with the exception of the small, additional element in a constitutional monarchy, in a recognition of the one man power as a basis of government, modified it may be, or diluted. It recognizes authority as existing in those alone whose social st tus is above the people ; it does not make the people the source of power, so that whether the legislation be favorable or not to their interests, it is both conceived and executed without their co operation.

Let us see how it is when the people choose directly their representatives. Does it then follow that legislation is necessarily favorable to their interests. How is it with the S. A. republics? How is it with France? did the votes of her people in her last revolution make her a republic? How is it with England? Looking at her from one side, her people are directly represented. by the eldest son ; looking at her from the other side, her people are indirectly represented, for, excepting the eldest son, all are excluded. But what is the result. Excepting the U. S., there is no country on earth where legislation results so much for the good of the people In France, in 1848, the people voted directly, but did that give them a republic, a government not only *for* the people, but *by* the people? How is it with the U. S.? Before the rebellion, the people of the south voted directly, they had the same Constitution, the same Federal laws that those of the north had, but were their interests represented? were the interests of the slave holder even represented? No, but there is one thing that was represented, and that, not in a three-fifths ratio but to the fullest extent, and that was—slavery.

Having seen in other countries instances where indirect representation does represent the interests of the people, and from the U. S., as well as other countries in-

stances where direct representation fails to attain that end, what are we to conclude.

It is this, and we can scarcely realize its importance. The principle which is not merely the corner-stone, but the foundation, the basis of a true, faithful, representation—Equality between the people and the representative. This must be the basis in all self-governments however various may be the ways by which this equality is expressed.

Let the sides of the equation be what they may, they must balance. If the representative is mentally and not morally, but socially *above* the represented, *there* is tyranny. If the representative is mentally and morally *below* the represented, *there* is anarchy ; there can be no alternative.

Where physical power is the basis of whatever exists as government, then is the chief of his tribe, the most perfect representative on Earth, that is, the elements of *his* character and those of the *individuals* of his tribe are more nearly balanced, the difference being merely that of degree, not of quality. So in the case of all societies where physical power is the prominent element in their organization.

But physical power alone being the lowest element in human existence, equality here is simply saying that all are low, there is no real superiority, no element that is elevating, progressive. We need not say that this is not the equality we want.

But further, when manufacturers of iron, chambers of commerce, rail-road committees, in short, producers of any kind, unite in sending men of like views with themselves to a convention organized for the purpose of advancing their interests either by promoting greater perfection, or for their pecuniary advantage ; or when they unite in petitioning either the National or local legislatures to pass laws which they consider to be for their

interests, those whom they send to represent those interests, we say are their representatives. Here is equality, but is that the equality which is needed?

A truly representative man is never a man of one idea, consequently a national representative can never represent one single interest.

What then should be the nature of this equality, and by what measures is it to be attained?

There is perhaps no word to which greater differences of meaning have been applied than to equality as applied to citizens of a State. There are two extremes which include many minor differences. One is, that of a social as well as political equality, bringing all indeed to a level, but *that* the level of the lowest, instead of raising the lowest, as much as possible, to the level of the highest. Such would make Nature's true nobility, the intelligent and virtuous, companions and associates of the ignorant and vicious. Instances of this are seen in mobs and all like movements which pretend to aim at equality, but, in reality, they are merely leveling. An extreme of an attempt at this is seen in the French Revolution.

The other extreme would have all share political equality, but would not only retain, but would rather increase the social position of the more elevated class, but all experience shows that this cannot be done without infringing on the social status of the inferior, and not only so, but where the restraints are sufficient to prevent the elevation of the social condition of the inferior, political equality will not long remain.

This brings us to a third and an entirely different view of equality, which recognizes not only a political but such a social equality as depends, not on wealth or connexion but on individual worth; recognizing the fact that there are worthy poor who are as intelligent and refined as those that wealth can afford. Not such a social

equality as would bring the ignorant and vulgar while such on a level with the educated, but such as would give them the means and encouragement to raise themselves from that degradation and their success in turn encourage others. That is the great hope of self-government, that the lowest may be able to elevate themselves. It will not do to be conservative here and thus treat the social condition of an individual as caste from which it is impossible either to rise or fall, neither will it do to be radical and thus acknowledge no social differences.

There never was a time in the history of the world, when there was more nearly an equality between leaders and people than during the American Revolution. The pledge of the Revolutionary Fathers to each other of their lives—was not confined to them alone; they not only supported each other, but they were supported by the people, and that was the secret of their success.

Though revolutions bring out the energies of great minds which might otherwise be latent, they do not prepare the people. They must be prepared before hand; if there is any harvest of good to be reaped, the people must be prepared to gather it in.

The French Revolution, instead of proving the overthrow of monarchial principles and the establishment of a government based upon equal rights, proved that the watch-word "Liberty, Equality and Reason," was to the French people an unknown god whom they ignorantly worshiped.

The overthrow of one dynasty only prepared the way for the elevation of an usurper. The first Napoleon, whatever else he may have been, was not a representative man, consequently could not be the executive in the formation of a representative government, a vital element in a republic.

LaFayette, whose sympathies for a feeble nation strug-

gling to be free, were based on the belief that they were prepared for self government, would gladly have been an instrument in securing the same blessings to his countrymen, but they received him not. Thus it has ever been in all stages of the world and always will be, until government based upon equal rights shall be established over all.

Successively representative men have arisen, who, though their views were perhaps not as enlarged as those of representative men at the present time, were sufficiently advanced to prevent co-operation. They were fit to lead, but the people were not prepared to appreciate them, and consequently would not follow. Webster, in his Hulseman letter, intimates that he thought something was wanting to Hungary of more importance than the material of war and numerical strength.

No individual is either purely physical, mental, or moral, but his individuality depends upon the proportion in which these elements are combined. Just so in government. Now the point that most concerns us is this, that just in the proportion that each or any of these elements exist in a people, just in that proportion will they be found in the legislative halls of that nation.

As every person makes his own individuality the medium through which he observes the world around him, no matter how limited or extended that may be, he will assimilate with whatever corresponds with the element that predominates in his character. If the physical element prevails and his nature be yielding, he will submit to tyranny; but if he brooks control, he will himself act the tyrant, and just so with the other elements. If combined with will and energy, they will command others; where will and energy are wanting, they will submit to a like influence in others.

Now in government, not only is it true that like people will produce like representatives, that is, an intelli-

gent people will choose an inte'ligent representative; a Christian peop'e, a Christian representative; while the champions of the ring and their like, will choose a like representative; not only is this true, but it is also true that whether or not the people have a voice in choosing their representatives, the predominating element in the people will still control legislation, because that element will, in reality, be a basis of legislation, and whatever class of men or of principles assimilate with that element, those men and those principles will control legislation.

Now when mind, soul and the physical powers exist in their due proportion and have all been developed and educated, each with regard to the interests of the others, we say that individual is well balanced, that he is a representative man, a type of true, Godlike manhood, and until a majority of the individuals composing a nation have attained this balance of the elements of their nature, no matter how many Washingtons they may have, how near like Moses their leaders may be, it is impossible for that nation to become independent, self governing.

Not till the 4th of July, '76, had the right of all to the enjoyment of equal rights been endorsed by a nation. It may have before been entertained by individuals, but it was then for the first time not only proclaimed, but acted upon. Eight years of relentless war carried on by a distant colony, not for sovereignty of territory, but fro sovereignty of manhood, received its final consumation 17th Sept, 1787. History, since then, has proved that struggle to have been indeed a revolution, and not merely a successful rebellion.

The United States have not lacked for imitators. Look at Mexico and the South American Republics, and like all efforts that are merely imitations they have proved failures, and why? They like the United States established direct representation; has that made them self-governing? Why not? For the leaders of a people to

proclaim that the nation is free, self-governing will not make them so. There never has been and never will be so long as the world stands, one single instance where a nation has become self-governing simply by proclamation. There must first be a general equality as regards capacity for national self-government before it can exist, even for a day.

There is no more perpetual motion in government than there is in machinery; it is true it may be set in motion, but it cannot be brought into line with wheels and bands and kept agoing; the motive power must be applied directly and without the least intermission; there cannot be a pause, it will prove a retrogade motion.

Let us see how the priciples we have laid down apply to Mexico and the South American Republics. In what proportion do the elements of government exist in them? All will recognize the existence of the physical and the moral elements, but where is the mental element. Where are the public schools, the family newspaper; where, in short, is the general education pervading the masses. It is wanting, and consequently any attempt at national self-government worthy the name, is also wanting.

It will always be found that the strength of the physical and the religious elements combined, will be in proportion to the lack of the mental element; hence the conflict and the struggle for liberty from the Christian era until the present.

Having seen the nature of the equality needed in order to a true faithful representation; it remains to be seen by what means that equality is to be attained.

First and foremost is, Christianity. Not merely as one of the elements of government, but as a principle pervading the whole. True, as being the embodyment of the religious element, it has its distinctive features and consequently its distinctive offices to perform; but it is far more than this. When true to itself, it controls and

dignifies the physical element, and directs and purifies the mental. It is the leaven pervading the whole lump. It is this, more than anything else, which makes the difference between the physical strength of the savage, and the physical strength of the Christian warrior; between a King Phillip and a Havelock; between the massacre of St. Bartholomew and the soul-inspiring defence of William of Orange and his associate martyrs.

It is generally considered that under a free government no religious test should ever be required as a qualification to any office. If religion there means Christianity, which it undoubtedly does, does it then follow that a person is a fit candidate for office who does not believe in the doctrines of Christianity. The effect of requiring no religious test whatever, is not only seen in the lack of principle of many holders of office, but spreads itself through society. That which is permitted in the highest cannot of course, be condemned in the lowest, and the effects of this are manifest, not only in the multitude of beliefs, but in the countenance given to infidel tendencies as seen in the press, in public speakers, and, with sadness be it spoken, in too many professed teachers of the Gospel. Instead of the public voice declaring that it makes no difference whether or not public men believe in the Bible, it should be declared in a voice too loud to be misunderstood, that an infidel patriot is a solceism of terms.

Next in importance in attaining to the desired equality is education. Except Christianity, there is nothing which tends more to regulate conduct than general intelligence. In a nation where all have equal rights it is not necessary that all should have equal capacity. All cannot be presidents nor executives of any name, but each one can and should possess such a knowledge of the rudiments of learning with integrity and moral courage to guide them in the application, that like the Prussian

army after its defeat by the first Napoleon, the force in the field may be only an index of the corps de reserve. Let such be the condition of things and the masses will not be slow to perceive any peculiar fitness of an individual for any particular line of duty.

We have thus very briefly touched upon the principles upon which is based representation in whatever form it may manifest itself. We have seen that every form of government is, to a certain degree, a representation of the people.

We have seen the touch-stone by which representation according to the population should be tested, namely, equality between the people and the representative; that any system which does not recognize this fundamental truth, will, if carried to an extreme, be seen to be opposed to national self-government, whether that extreme tend to barbarism or to an enervating civilization. We have seen the nature of that equality, that it consists not merely in the recognition of the universal brotherhood, but of the universal manhood of man.

We have seen Christianity and education necessary, not only to the existence of that equality but entering into its very nature, so that whatever tends to destroy the due proportions of either, destroys that equality and consequently makes national self-government an impossibility.

I have thus brought to a conclusion, a very brief and imperfect synopsis of what I would write as the History of Liberty.

Though the subject is well nigh too full for utterance—being as it is the consumation of all that earth can give, it includes them all—the thoughts which it breathes must find expression. Were I to pause and consider the comprehensiveness of the work, I might well stop before proceeding further.

"Though declamation and eloquence in all ages have

exhausted their store upon this favorite theme, yet reason has made so little progress in ascertaining the nature and boundaries of liberty, that there are very few authors indeed, either of this or of any o'her country, which can furnish the studious and serious reader with a clear and consistent account of this idol of mankind."*

Is it true that Liberty is above that reason which alone can comprehend its nature, and thus point out those principles the adoption of which will secure the possession of Liberty? In other words, is Liber'y, though it be universally regarded as the greatest of earthly blessings, above and beyond the highest temporal attribute of that very being for whose benefit the blessing is conferred? Were it so, well would it have been had God denied the boon to mankind, for then would the fabled Tantalus have indeed been a reality, and God, while offering to us the greatest of earthly possessions, would have palsied the hand that would grasp it.

But, thank God, it is not so.

History in general should be so written that the reader cannot tell to what nation the author belongs, but it is impossible for one to write the history of Liberty whose whole nature is not imbued with its inspiration.

It matters little whether or not I finish the work begun, it will be accomplished. Some one will be found to whom the task will indeed be a labor of love.

Having an understanding of its principles, we shall be enabled so to carry them out, that our earthly Liberty will receive its full and final consumation in that *Liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free.*

---

* Blackstone, p. 126, Of the Rights of Persons. Ed. note.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 027 119 759 7